

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,281	10/31/2003	Kazuo Okada	SHO-0055	8441
23353 RADER FISH	7590 09/03/2010 MAN & GRAUER PLLO	EXAMINER		
LION BUILD	ING	HOTALING, JOHN M		
	TREET N.W., SUITE 501 ON, DC 20036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		3714	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/03/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/697,281	OKADA, KAZUO	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JOHN M. HOTALING	3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply

C4-4		

WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE (nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). II SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.	n no event, however, may a reply be timely filed y and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	. , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 Octobe	r 2009.			
	This action is FINAL . 2b) This actio				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex par	te Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims				
4)⊠	4) Claim(s) 5.7.10.16 and 38-41 is/are pending in the application.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)□) Claim(s) <u>5,7,10,16 and 38-41</u> is/are rejected.				
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or elec	tion requirement.			
Applicati	ion Papers				
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted	or b) objected to by the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawin	g(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is	required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)[The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	er. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12)🖾	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priori	ty under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a)	☑ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.				
	 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage				
	application from the International Bureau (PC	T Rule 17.2(a)).			
* 8	See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	certified copies not received.			
Attachmen	it(s)				
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date			
	Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)				

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

6) Other: _____

Application/Control Number: 10/697,281 Page 2

Art Unit: 3714

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 10, 16 & 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchida (US 6,343,161) and Ahuja (US 6,157,529) in view of Bowron (US 7,374,258). The previous rejection is maintained and incorporated herein. With respect to the amended subject matter regarding an "electrically grounded gaming machine" and "wherein the image control device is built in and connected to an upper portion of the electronically grounded game machine" the examiner would like to point out that inherently all gaming machines are electrically grounded. First, game machines electronic components are grounded in order to work. Secondly the gaming chassis is grounded in order to prevent tampering and for protection of the person using the game machine. With respect to the location and placement of the image control device please see Bowron figure 2 part number 34 and 62 which are the computer and the power supply which are built in the upper portion of a gaming cabinet. While many different there exists many different hardware and cabinet construction in the art one would be motivated to employ this type of hardware architecture just as well as any other hardware architecture in a gaming machine. Therefore it would be obvious to combine the above reference in order to anticipate the claimed invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/697,281

Art Unit: 3714

Claims 7 and 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchida (US 6,343,161) and Ahuja (US 6,157,529) in view of Bowron (US 7,374,258) as applied to the claims above in further view of Loose et al (US 6,517,433). The previous rejection with respect to Uchida, Ahuja and Loose are maintained and incorporated herein. Bowron is applied to the rejection as explained above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/20/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner has noticed that the applicants representative has cancelled claim 9 and inserted it into all of the independent claims alleging that the position of the image control device or lets just say the whole machine controller is critical. The examiner notes that the applicant representative states and points out that the specification of the instant application puts the controller in this location in order to avoid static electricity. Therefore the examiner has found some references where the controller is located in the upper portion of the cabinet. With respect to the position of the controller and avoiding electro static charge the examiner notes that this type of control circuitry is commonplace in game machines and is usually well protected within the cabinet since such goes thru extensive testing including a shock test where electricity is applied to the game machine. The examiner further notes that none of the static requirements are in the claims. The remainder of applicants arguments are statements of what is contained in the claims and that the rejection does not anticipate

Art Unit: 3/14

the claims as amended. The above rejection is applicable to the amended portions of the claims not that the criticality of the placement of the controller has been established.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The Prior art listed in the 892 is relevant to the power circuitry or grounding of gaming machines

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/697,281

Art Unit: 3714

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN M. HOTALING whose telephone number is (571)272-4437. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (571) 272 3750. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John M Hotaling II/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714